UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,891	10/10/2006	Werner Heidel	RW-176PCT	9896
40570 FRIEDRICH K	7590 01/06/200 UEFFNER	9	EXAMINER	
317 MADISON	AVENUE, SUITE 91	0	SEIFU, LESSANEWORK T	
NEW YORK, NY 10017			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Арр	lication No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary			553,891	HEIDEL, WERN	HEIDEL, WERNER			
			miner	Art Unit				
		Less	sanework Seifu	1797				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appears	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence	address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>21 Octobe</i>	r 2005					
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 October 2005</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)		<i>'</i> —		atters, prosecution as to t	he merits is			
- / 🗀	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the	application.						
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.							
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
•	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or elec	tion requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner						
• —	The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 October 2</u>		accepted or b)	objected to by the Exam	iner.			
. 9/23	Applicant may not request that any obje	· ·		-				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including			•				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t	_	· ·	*	, ,			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)□ All b)□ Some * c)⊠ None of:								
	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application								
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 10/21/05.		5) Notice					
	. ,		, —	 _				

Application/Control Number: 10/553,891 Page 2

Art Unit: 1797

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.
- 3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 contains the trademark/trade name Velcro. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe the adhesive strips and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Regarding claims 1, the phrase "or the like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Regarding claims 1 and 15, the phrase "such as" renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

In claim 1, the recitation "a free programmable device", in the last line of the claim, renders the claim indefinite because it is not clear what applicant intended to encompass by the limitation "a free programmable device".

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the superabsorbers" in line 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites "its both side walls" at page 3, lines 11-12. It is unclear as to which structural element applicant is referring to by the term "its" in the claim.

In claim 1 there are two occurrences of "a discharge duct", the first, at page 3, lines 5-6 and the second, at page 4, line 6, of the Claims. It is not clear as to which discharge duct the claims are referring to when the claims recite the limitation "the discharge duct".

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board

Application/Control Number: 10/553,891 Page 4

Art Unit: 1797

of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 1 recites the broad recitation a discharge device, at page 3, line 3, and the claim also recites preferably a discharge duct configured as a slide with an inclination, which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hohnen et al. (US 2003/0019961).

Regarding claims 1-15, Hohnen et al. disclose a device and a method for the insitu disposal of sanitary waste. The device disclosed in Hohnen et al. comprises substantially all of the structural elements of the claimed device. Hohnen et al. disclose that the device for the in-situ disposal of sanitary waste has a housing (11) containing a

fixed drum-type container (20) having a horizontal central axis and with an opening (22) and a plurality of inlet pipes (41, 42, 43) (see Abstract and Fig. 4). Hohnen et al. further disclose a discharge duct (108) configured as a slide with an inclination in direction of the discharge for transfer of materials out of the bottom area of the container (20) (see Fig. 6 and parag. [0061]). Hohnen et al. further disclose that the inner space of container (20) is provided with vertical knife disks (40, 140) (see Fig. 6). Hohnen et al. further disclose that the vertical knives can be driven into rotation and are place on opposing wall faces within the container (20). Hohnen et al. further disclose that the vertical knives have tearing knives (40, 140) which are turned to the inner space of the container (20) (see parag. [0061] and Fig. 6]). Hohnen et al. further disclose a compressor screw (105) placed in a tubular housing (see Fig. 6). Hohnen et al. further disclose a shear sieve sheet (30 b) place in the inner space of container (20). Hohnen et al. further disclose a pump (50) connected to a discharge pipe (26) (see parag. [0048]). Hohnen et al. further disclose a program switching device (80) for combining the control of supply materials, the control of driving devices, and the control pumps (see parag. [0051]). The recited method steps in claims 14 and 15 read on the device and method disclosed in Hohnen et al (see parag. [0053] to [0056] and Fig. 6).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lessanework Seifu whose telephone number is (571)270-3153. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thr 7:00am-5:30pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,891 Page 6

Art Unit: 1797

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/Walter D. Griffin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797